



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
-----------------	-------------	----------------------	---------------------	------------------

10/817,330

04/02/2004

Qi Jia

0062.26

1136

25871 7590 09/16/2010  
SWANSON & BRATSCHEUN, L.L.C.  
8210 SOUTHPARK TERRACE  
LITTLETON, CO 80120

EXAMINER

WINSTON, RANDALL O

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

1655

NOTIFICATION DATE

DELIVERY MODE

09/16/2010

ELECTRONIC

**Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.**

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Notice of the Office communication was sent electronically on above-indicated "Notification Date" to the following e-mail address(es):

efspatents@sbiplaw.com

<b>Office Action Summary</b>	<b>Application No.</b> 10/817,330	<b>Applicant(s)</b> JIA, QI	
	<b>Examiner</b> Randall Winston	<b>Art Unit</b> 1655	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

### Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

### Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 03 March 2010.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

### Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 19-21, 24-30, 32, 46-50, 52-55, 58, 60, 62, 63 and 66 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 19-21, 24-30, 32, 46-50, 52-55, 58, 60, 62, 63 and 66 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

### Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.  
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

### Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some \* c) ☐ None of:
- ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
  - ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
  - ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

### Attachment(s)

- |   |   |
|---|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)   | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)<br>Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)   | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application                       |
| 3) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)<br>Paper No(s)/Mail Date <u>0109, 0409, 0609, 0809, 0310, 0610, 0710</u> . | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____  |

## **DETAILED ACTION**

### ***Continued Examination Under 37 CFR 1.114***

A request for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, including the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e), was filed in this application after final rejection. Since this application is eligible for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, and the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e) has been timely paid, the finality of the previous Office action has been withdrawn pursuant to 37 CFR 1.114. Applicant's submission filed on 03/03/2010.

Claims 19-2, 24-30, 32, 46-50, 52-55, 58, 60, 62-63 and 66 have been examined on the merits.

Applicants' arguments presented within the 03 March 2010 reply concerning the previous art rejection of record are deemed moot in view of the new grounds of rejection set forth above.

### ***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 19-21, 24-30, 32, 46-50, 52-55, 58, 60, 62-63 and 66 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Santo et al. (US 7615239) in view of Xu (US 6,083,921) and Zhou (US 6,319,523).

Applicant claims a pharmaceutical composition (i.e. topical in a cream form) comprising Free-B-ring flavonoid (i.e. baicalin), Flavans (i.e. catechin) and excipients in various amounts.

Santo teaches that baicalin is extracted from *Scutellaria* for an anti-bacterial purpose (see. e.g. column 5 lines 15-19). Santo does not expressly beneficially teach a topically applied composition comprising the claimed baicalin extracted from *Scutellaria* in a claimed form such as cream to be applied to the skin nor does Santo expressly teach the Flavan of catechin included within its pharmaceutical composition used for an anti-bacterial purpose.

Xu beneficially teaches a topical pharmaceutical composition [please note that Xu discloses in its specification in column 12 lines 25-32 that using a suppository for vaginal administration to be contacted (i.e. contacted meaning applying) to the skin in the form of cream and/or gel for an anti-bacterial purpose] comprising baicalin (i.e. the baicalin is extracted from *Scutellaria*) and excipients (i.e. the pharmaceutical carrier could be water) within a pharmaceutical composition used for an anti-bacterial purpose (see, e.g. entire patent including abstract, column 12 lines 25-32 and claims 1 and 7).

Zhou beneficially teaches catechin (i.e. the catechin is extracted from *Acacia catechu*) contained within a pharmaceutical composition used for anti-bacterial purpose (see, e.g. abstract, claims, especially claims 1 and 5).

Art Unit: 1655

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Santo's composition teachings of placing the claimed baicalin extracted from *Scutellaria* within a cream base as taught by Xu and also to include the other active ingredient of catechin as taught in Zhou because the above combined cited references as a whole would create the claimed topical pharmaceutical composition in the form of a cream comprising all the claimed active ingredients to be applied to the skin for an anti-bacterial purpose. Moreover, as discussed in MPEP Section 2114.06, "it is *prima facie* obvious to combine two or more compositions each of which is taught by the prior art to be useful for the same purpose (e.g. an anti-bacterial purpose), in order to form a third composition to used for the same purpose". The adjustments of other conventional working conditions (i.e. determining suitable amounts/ranges of each active ingredient within the claimed composition and the substitution of one form for another such as the composition is formulated in a regular of controlled releasing vehicle or as a gel or lotion), is deemed a matter of judicious selection and routine optimization which is well within the purview of the skilled artisan.

Accordingly, the invention as a whole is *prima facie* obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made, especially in the absence of evidence to the contrary.

Please note, the intended use of the above claimed composition (i.e. the pharmaceutical composition for use in the treatment of cyclooxygenase (COX) and (LOX) mediated diseases and/or alleviating inflammation when applied to the skin and/or inflammatory conditions and/or skin conditions) does not patentably distinguish the composition, per se, since such undisclosed use is intrinsic to the composition reasonably suggested by the cited references above (see, e.g., MPEP 2112).

Please also note that the patentability of a product (i.e. in claims 24-29) does not depend upon the method of production. If the product in a product-by-process claim is the same as or obvious from a product of the prior art, then the claim is unpatentable even though the prior art product was made by a different process" (see, e.g. MPEP 2113).

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Randall Winston whose telephone number is 571-272-0972. The examiner can normally be reached on 8AM-5PM.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Terry McKelvey can be reached on 571-272-0775. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Art Unit: 1655

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

RW

/Christopher R. Tate/  
Primary Examiner, Art Unit 1655